arXiv:1612.06644v1 [physics.soc-ph] 20 Dec 2016

Zealotry Effects on Opinion Dynamics in the Adaptive Voter Model

Pascal P. Klamser and Marc Wiedermann
Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, P.O. Box 60 12 03, 14412 Potsdam, Germany, EU and Department of Physics, Humboldt University, Newtonstr. 15, 12489 Berlin, Germany, EU

Jonathan F. Donges
Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, P.O. Box 60 12 03, 14412 Potsdam, Germany, EU and Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholm University, Kräftriket 2B, 114 19 Stockholm, Sweden, EU

Reik V. Donner
Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, P.O. Box 60 12 03, 14412 Potsdam, Germany, EU

(Dated: December 21, 2016)

The adaptive voter model has been widely studied as a conceptual model for opinion formation processes on time-evolving social networks. Past studies on the effect of zealots, i.e. nodes aiming to spread their fixed opinion throughout the system, only considered the voter model on a static network. Here, we extend the study of zealotry to the case of an adaptive network topology co-evolving with the state of the nodes and investigate opinion spreading induced by zealots depending on their initial density and connectedness. Numerical simulations reveal that below the fragmentation threshold a low density of zealots is sufficient to spread their opinion to the whole network. Beyond the transition point, zealots must exhibit an increased degree as compared to ordinary nodes for an efficient spreading of their opinion. We verify the numerical findings using a mean-field approximation of the model yielding a low-dimensional set of coupled ordinary differential equations. Our results imply that the spreading of the zealot opinion in the adaptive voter model is strongly dependent on the rate of link rewiring and the average degree of normal nodes in comparison with that of the zealots. In order to avoid a complete dominance of the zealots' opinion, there are two possible strategies for the remaining nodes: adjusting the rate of rewiring and/or the number of connections with other nodes, respectively.

I. INTRODUCTION

The study of opinion dynamics on social networks is a popular application of network and complex systems theory [1, 2]. The voter model is a widely investigated idealized model describing the dynamical behavior of individual opinions on social networks and represents a bridge between instructive toy models in physics and social science [3–6]. Closely related to the voter model are epidemic models on a network structure, where the opinion corresponds to the health state of a node [7–10].

The problem of driving a given system to a desired state (like a certain consensus opinion) is commonly addressed by concepts of control theory [11–14]. Specifically, the problem of network controllability was reformulated as an eigenvalue problem [12], the applicability of which to real-world networks has been discussed in [13]. As a result, a simple control strategy for heterogeneous networks was proposed [14]. From this problem setting, interesting concepts arose (such as the maximum matching set, i.e. the maximum set of links which do not share the same start and end nodes) to identify the minimum set of driver nodes to structurally control the whole network [11]. Surprisingly, with this procedure hub nodes are avoided as driver nodes.

From the perspective of opinion dynamics and, more specifically, the voter model, the concept of zealots is closely related to the problem of controlling network dynamics. In analogy to control theory zealots can be seen as nodes receiving an input signal which pins their state [15]. Their effect has been studied on regular lattices with a single zealot [3] and with a finite number of zealots on regular, complete [4] and random graphs [16]. The latter study found a transition at a specific density of zealots where the time to reach consensus was drastically decreased. Moreover, the optimal topological placement of zealots was investigated [17, 18], whereby high-degree hubs were found to be good positions from where to spread the opinion. Extremists in bounded confidence opinion models can be seen as a weak form of zealots [5, 6]. In contrast to zealots, they can still change their opinion, but this process is very unlikely as compared to other nodes. Again, hubs were found to be good placements for extremists to bias the overall opinion.

All aforementioned studies assumed dynamics on a fixed network structure. However, the results obtained do not apply to systems with a time-evolving network topology [19]. Adaptive networks as in the adaptive voter model (AVM) [20] or more realistic models [21] generate a time-dependent network structure through a feedback mechanism between topology and node (agent) states. The AVM extended the classical voter model by giving the nodes the possibility to break an existing link and reconnect to a like-minded node which results in a temporally evolving network. The controllability of temporal networks was investigated, alongside other studies, by a time-respecting path-based method [22] and by an analytical approach combined with graphical tools [23].

The latter study revealed a positive relation between the aggregated degree of a node, the number of interactions during a given time, and the size of the subset which is controlled by it. Both studies quantified the controllable subset by the influence of a single node, assuming linear dynamics and considering networks which are statistically equivalent at different times. However, it has remained unclear so far how the control of the AVM could be best achieved or avoided, because its dynamics are strongly nonlinear and the network is in certain parameter regimes evolving in such a way that it is not statistically equivalent at different times. To our best knowledge, the concept of zealots, widely studied in the static voter model, has not yet been applied in the AVM. Since it is a relevant conceptual model for opinion formation on temporal networks, the rule-simplicity of which allows a fair degree of understanding, we see a great interest in addressing the issues mentioned above.

Consequently, this paper addresses the efficiency of control by zealot opinion spreading (ZOS) in an extension of the AVM. Here, the zealots are chosen at random and possess additional links and therefore an excess degree compared to ordinary nodes, which is beneficial for the spreading, as former related studies suggest [5, 6, 17, 18, 23]. The excess degree is not only motivated by the expected effect on the spreading but also from real world examples [24]. For example, election campaigns aim to reach as many voters (nodes) as possible. Following their mission, campaigners are not convinced by voters, there is only a unidirectional influence of campaigners on voters. Additionally, campaigners reach an effectively increased degree in social networks due to their professional outreach efforts [24]. Another example for zealotry are lobbyists intervening in political processes. The number of zealots and their excess degree can be interpreted as a measure of the resources that need to be invested to pursue the campaign. Another important issue is how easily a system can be controlled and what needs to be changed in order to increase its resilience against external pressure or corruption.

After the description of the model and methods in Sect. II, we focus on how the zealot opinion is spread over clusters of different sizes in Sect. III. Thereby, we identify subgraphs with a significantly larger mean degree than in the whole network. We identify three different parameter regimes, closely related to the phase transition in the AVM, in which different effects lead to a significant increase in the spreading efficiency of the zealots' opinion. Finally we confirm our numerical microscopic results by an analytical macroscopic approximation of the AVM including zealots (Sect. IV). Results are discussed and conclusions drawn in Sect. V.

II. METHODS

A. Model description

We study the AVM in the version originally formulated by Holme and Newman [20], but thoroughly extended by introducing zealots with excess degree. Here, the two processes governing the opinion dynamics in a network with N nodes, also referred to as voters, and G opinions are the change of node opinions and the link rewiring process, the mathematical formulation of which will be presented in the following. As the most crucial parameter of the resulting adaptive network model, the rewiring probability ϕ is considered as the fraction of cases with which the latter process takes place instead of the former. Each node i initially possesses an opinion g_i, which is on average the opinion of a number of $\gamma_0 = N/G$ nodes. The dynamic update cycle of the model is then described as follows:

Step 1: Randomly select a node i. If the degree k_i of node i is zero do nothing, otherwise randomly select a neighbor $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$.
Step 2(a): With probability ϕ, delete the link to j and rewire to a randomly selected node of the set $\mathcal{S}_i$ (rewiring).
Step 2(b): With probability $(1-\phi)$, node i imitates the opinion of node j and, thus, $g_i \to g_j$ (imitation).

The set of nodes $\mathcal{S}_i = \mathcal{S}_{g_i} \backslash \{\{i\} \cup \mathcal{N}_i\}$ is obtained by excluding from the set $\mathcal{S}_{g_i}$ of nodes having opinion g_i the node i itself and its nearest neighbors $\mathcal{N}_i$. In contrast to the classical formulation of the AVM, no multiple links and self-loops are possible due to node rewiring to the set $\mathcal{S}_i$ (instead of rewiring to the set $\mathcal{S}_{g_i}$ as in the standard AVM). Note that rule 2 is applied regardless of an existing opinion conflict. The algorithm is iteratively repeated until a time t_c, where the consensus is reached in such that like-minded nodes are connected to each other ($\mathcal{N}_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{g_i}\ \forall i$).

It shall be stressed, that the rules employed in this model variant are based on node selection [20, 25, 26] instead of link selection [27–29], because we consider it more realistic for a social network that agents (nodes) spend on average the same time for communicating with others. The number of nodes N and the total number of links M stay constant with time, which implies keeping the mean degree $\overline{k}_0 = \frac{2M}{N}$ constant.

Zealots are nodes that cannot be convinced and carry a new opinion g_z. The set of zealots $\mathcal{S}_z$ is created at the start of each simulation by randomly declaring a fraction of nodes n_z^0 to be zealots. Their key property of having an immutable opinion is ensured by modifying the last step in the above scheme:

Step 2 (b) With probability $(1-\phi)$, if $i \in S_z$ do nothing, otherwise node i adopts the opinion of node j.

The initial mean degree of zealots is increased by the

excess degree k_x to $\overline{k}_z(t=0) = \overline{k}_0 + k_x$, whereas the degree of individual zealots changes over time due to the update cycle. The excess degree is motivated by the additional efforts of campaigners or lobbyists to convince as many nodes as possible. Note that the initial fraction of nodes holding opinion g_z is $n_{g_z}(0) = n_z^0$. To simplify the notation, n_{g_z} will be denoted in the following as $n_z = n_{g_z}$. The additional links k_x are randomly connected to non-zealots. Introducing the excess degree k_x increases the mean degree of the whole network to $\overline{k} = \overline{k}_0 + 2n_z^0 k_x$ and the introduction of zealots changes the average number of nodes initially holding the same opinion different from g_z to $\gamma = \gamma_0(1 - n_z^0)$.

B. Perspectives on zealot opinion spreading

Zealots are nodes with excess degree intending to spread their fixed opinion g_z to as many other non-zealot nodes as possible. In this special case, we investigate the zealot opinion spreading (ZOS) process characterized by the fraction of nodes $n_z(t)$ holding the zealots' opinion, which is a special opinion since it is (unlike the others) always present due to the zealots that cannot become convinced by others. The ZOS efficiency is defined as the fraction of nodes $n_z(t_c)$ holding opinion g_z when the consensus state is reached.

The considered problem can also be viewed from a controllability perspective. Here, zealots are just normal nodes that are influenced by a constant control signal $b(t) = b$ which fixes their opinion to g_z. The excess degree k_x of zealots can be viewed as a "topological input signal" applied to the network only once at $t = 0$. In real-world applications constraints exist, in form of resource limitations (campaigners or lobbyists needs to be paid) or ideology (not everyone wants to be a zealot), which motivates us to limit the number of nodes which can receive the said control signal $b(t)$.

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

The AVM, obeying the discrete-time update rules as described in Section II A, starts evolving at $t = 0$ from a Erdős-Rényi random graph, which is known to exhibit a giant component if $\overline{k}_0 \geq 1$ [1, 30]. A phase transition occurs when increasing the rewiring rate ϕ to a level at which the giant component of the initial network vanishes and homogeneous clusters are formed by like-minded nodes. This fragmentation transition occurs at a critical rewiring rate ϕ_c (for fixed mean degree $\overline{k}$) or at a critical mean degree $\overline{k}_c$ (for fixed ϕ). In what follows, we will mostly follow the strategy of varying ϕ but keeping the mean degree fixed.

One way of identifying the fragmentation transition and the associated parameter value ϕ_c is based on critical slowing down marked by a maximum of the coefficient of variation $V_t = \sigma_{t_c}/\overline{t}_c$ of the consensus time as



FIG. 1. (Color online) Coefficient of variation of consensus time V_t, indicating a phase transition at $\phi = \phi_c$ where the giant component vanishes. The different parameter settings are (a) no zealots $n_z^0 = 0$, (b) zealot density $n_z^0 = 0.01$ with no excess degree $k_x = 0$ and (c) zealot density $n_z^0 = 0.01$ with an excess degree of $k_x = 20$. The red line in (a, b) marks $\phi_c = 0.46$ and in (c) $\phi_c = 0.505$. The phase transition shifts if the excess degree k_x is nonzero. Distributions are computed from $n = 10^4$ runs on graphs with $N = 800$ nodes and a mean degree (without the zealots' excess degree) of $\overline{k}_0 = 4$.

a characteristic parameter, where $\overline{t}_c$ and σ_{t_c} denote the empirical mean value and standard deviation of the consensus time estimated from a sufficiently large ensemble of independent realizations of the considered AVM variant [20]. In the present work, V_t is estimated as a function of ϕ for $N = 800$, $\overline{k}_0 = 4$, $\gamma_0 = 10$ and 10^4 simulation runs (Fig. 1). If no zealots exist (Fig. 1(a)) the phase transition is at $\phi_c \approx 0.46$, as expected from previous studies [20]. If only few zealots are introduced ($n_z^0 = 0.01$) (Fig. 1(b)) the phase transition is not altered. However, declaring them as hubs with an excess degree of $k_x = 20$ (Fig. 1(c)) shifts the phase transition to $\phi_c = 0.505$. Since the mean degree has a strong impact on the transition [20] the shift can be explained by the change of the mean degree $\overline{k}_0 \to \overline{k} = 4.4$. Simulations with $\overline{k}_0 = 4.4$ and no zealots (not shown) indeed perfectly reproduce the observed shift, implying the redistribution of the additional links to the whole network in $t \leq t_c$.

Another phenomenon is observed if the zealots' excess degree is increased, which manifests in a second broad maximum of V_t in Fig. 1(c) at about $\phi = 0.08$.This secondary maximum is shifted towards larger ϕ if k_x is further increased (not shown). It is explained by decreasing the diameter of the network when hubs are intro-

duced. For $\phi < 0.08$ zealots remain hubs due to the low rewiring probability and the largest part of the network is dominated by the zealot opinion across all samples at about the same time which reduces the variance of t_c. At $\phi \approx 0.08$ rewiring is redistributing the excess degree, and the diameter of the network fluctuates strongly between different samples increasing σ_t and thus V_t as well. However, this effect is not relevant for the ZOS because the secondary maximum of V_t is located below the fragmentation threshold.

The most straightforward approach to maximize the ZOS efficiency $n_z(t_c)$ is to dominate the largest connected component at consensus time. In the following, we will refer to connected communities with homogeneous node state (opinion) as clusters. In Fig. 2, the resulting frequency distribution $P(s)$ of cluster sizes s (i.e. the number of nodes in a cluster) is shown for rewiring probabilities below (a, b, c), close to (d, e, f) and above the fragmentation threshold (g, h, i) of the three cases presented in Fig. 1.

The distributions without zealots are characterized by a giant component below the critical point ϕ_c (Fig. 2(a)), by a power-law behavior close to the transition (Fig. 2(d)) and by the absence of a giant component above the fragmentation threshold (Fig. 2(g)), where the cluster size s is distributed around γ, indicated by a vertical line in Fig. 2(g). Since no zealots and therefore no opinion g_z are present the ZOS efficiency is always zero.

Below the fragmentation transition, zealots dominate the giant component with and without excess degree (Fig. 2(b, c)) and on average spread their opinion to a fraction of $n_z \approx 0.98$ nodes. Close to ϕ_c, the distribution of clusters having opinion g_z (red squares) of zealots without excess degree (Fig. 2(e)) is similar to the total distribution (blue triangles) with the difference that convinced clusters have a size of at least n_z^0, indicated by a red dashed line. The excess degree (Fig. 2(f)) causes a peak at larger cluster sizes. The size distribution of convinced clusters starts at a size significantly larger than n_z^0 and coincides at larger cluster sizes with the total distribution, which shows that the corresponding maximum consists solely of convinced clusters. At the fragmentation transition the cluster distribution is expected to obey a power-law (Fig. 2(d, e)) which is disturbed by the peak if zealots posses an excess degree (Fig. 2(f)). Consequently it can be assumed that the excess degree is splitting the system into g_z-dominated subgraphs which have a larger mean degree than subgraphs that are not influenced by the zealots' opinion and excess degree. Hence, the g_z-dominated subgraphs effectively lie below or closer to the local fragmentation transition and, therefore, tend to form larger clusters (Fig. 2(f)). These subgraphs give rise to a five times larger ZOS efficiency as compared to the case of zealots without excess degree (Fig. 2(e)).

The g_z-dominated subgraphs are also present above the fragmentation threshold, which is indicated by the fact that the previously discussed maximum of the cluster size distribution does not vanish suddenly but is gradually shifted towards smaller cluster sizes (Fig. 2(i)). In the case without excess degree (Fig. 2(h)), far above the transition point the size distribution of convinced clusters exhibits a maximum at n_z^0 (red line), while in the case with excess degree (Fig. 2(i)) this maximum is shifted to larger cluster sizes, resulting in almost twice as high ZOS efficiency as compared to the case with $k_x = 0$.



FIG. 2. (Color online) Frequency distributions of cluster size $P(s)$ at $t = t_c$ for all clusters (blue triangles) and for the fraction of convinced clusters (red squares) computed from $n = 10^4$ simulation runs on graphs with $N = 800$ and $\gamma_0 = 10$. The distributions are computed for no zealots $n_z^0 = 0$ (a, d, g), for zealot density $n_z^0 = 0.01$ and no excess degree $k_x = 0$ (b, e, h) and for zealot density $n_z^0 = 0.01$ and excess degree $k_x = 20$ (c, f, i). The rows represent different values of the rewiring rate ϕ: $\phi = 0.04 \ll \phi_c$ (a, b, c), $\phi = \phi_c(\overline{k})$ (d, e, f) and $\phi = 0.96 \gg \phi_c$ (g, h, i). Blue solid and red dashed vertical lines indicate $\gamma_0 = 10$ and initial number of zealots Nn_z^0 respectively. Note the black arrows indicating the giant component.

In summary, the cluster size distributions reveal that ZOS close to and above the fragmentation transition is more efficient if hub-zealots are present due to a formation of convinced subgraphs with a larger local $\overline{k}$. Below the transition point, the mere existence of zealots is sufficient to reach a maximum ZOS efficiency.

So far, the only parameter settings considered have been no zealots and zealots with initial density $n_z^0 = 0.01$ with and without excess degree $k_x = 20$. We now study a much wider set of parameters regarding the ZOS at consensus $n_z(t_c)$ (Fig. 3). The horizontal and vertical axes in Fig. 3 represent the excess degree k_x and density n_z^0 of zealots. The parameters $\overline{k}_0 = 4$ and $N = 800$ are kept constant. Three different rewiring rates are considered: $\phi = 0.25 < \phi_c(\overline{k}_0)$ (Fig. 3(a)), $\phi = 0.5 > \phi_c(\overline{k}_0)$ (Fig. 3(b)) and $\phi = 0.75 > \phi_c(\overline{k}_0)$ (Fig. 3(c)). Note that the fragmentation threshold depends on both k_x and ϕ and the critical rewiring rate $\phi_c(\overline{k}_0) = 0.46$ can therefore only be considered as a reference point for $k_x = 0$. Thus for a fixed ϕ there exists a critical mean degree $\overline{k}_c$. If this mean degree is exceeded, the system is below its



FIG. 3. (Color online) Fraction of convinced nodes at the consensus state $n_z(t_c)$ as a function of excess degree k_x and zealot density n_z^0. The rewiring probability is increased from (a) $\phi = 0.25$ via (b) $\phi = 0.5$ to (c) $\phi = 0.75$. The black lines in (b, c) indicate $\phi_c(\overline{k}) \approx \phi$. The white line in (c) represents the mean degree where $\phi_c(\overline{k}_z) \approx \phi$ which considers convinced clusters only. All results have been computed from 400 simulation runs on networks with $N = 800$ nodes and a mean degree without zealots of $\overline{k}_0 = 4$.

fragmentation threshold, and, hence, in a regime where ZOS profits from the presence of a giant component.

In general, we find that the ZOS efficiency is maximal for every configuration below the fragmentation transition (Fig. 3(a)), because a giant component is easily dominated.

Just above the transition (Fig. 3(b)), the presence of additional zealots increases the ZOS efficiency as expected. However, ZOS efficiency quickly saturates to a maximum if together with an elevated excess degree, the critical degree $\overline{k}_c = 4.4$ is reached where the giant component fragments.

Finally, far above $\phi_c(\overline{k}_0)$ (Fig. 3(c)), the fragmentation transition is reached at $\overline{k}_c = 9$ (black contour line) with, of course, larger amounts of zealots and excess degrees. It is remarkable that already below the corresponding transition point, ZOS efficiency increases to multiples of n_z^0. This effect can be explained by the convinced clusters that have larger mean degree than unconvinced ones (compare Fig. 2(f)). Note that the mean degree of convinced clusters $\overline{k}_z$ at consensus crosses $\overline{k}_c$ already at a smaller zealot density and excess degree than the total mean degree (the case $\overline{k}_z = \overline{k}_c$ is marked by a white contour line in Fig. 3(c)). Those subgraphs with larger mean degree are a key finding of this study and can be interpreted as a community in which intense discourses were triggered by the excess degrees of the zealots and their opinion.

IV. MACROSCOPIC APPROXIMATION

For a model similar to that studied in the present work [26], it was recently shown that a mean-field approximation can be performed to derive analytical results by considering solely pairwise interactions and under the assumptions that the network is large and fully connected at initiation. In the latter work, only two distinct node states (aka opinions) have been present. This assumption is adopted in the following by treating all opinions different from g_z as equivalent, i.e. as the opinion of the others g_o. Following [26], this simplification reduces the problem to three coupled differential equations for the time evolution of three macroscopic properties of the model: the fraction of nodes n_z holding opinion g_z and the average numbers of links per node m_z (m_o) among nodes holding opinion g_z (g_o):

$$\frac{dn_z}{dt} = (1-\phi)\left[n_o P_o^z - (n_z - n_z^0)P_z^o\right] \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{dm_z}{dt} = \phi n_z P_z^o + (1-\phi)\left[P_o^z m_{zo} - \frac{n_z - n_z^0}{n_z} 2P_z^o m_z\right] \tag{2}$$

$$\frac{dm_o}{dt} = \phi n_o P_o^z + (1-\phi)\left[\frac{n_z - n_z^0}{n_z} P_z^o m_{zo} - 2P_o^z m_o\right] \tag{3}$$

Here, $m_{zo} = M_{zo}/N$ where M_{zo} is the number of "active" links between nodes of distinct opinions g_z and g_o, respectively. P_z^o is the probability of a g_z node to interact with a g_o node and is given by the heterogeneous mean-field approximation [26]:

$$P_z^o = \frac{k_z^o}{k_z} = \frac{m_{zo}}{2m_z + m_{zo}} \tag{4}$$

Here, k_z is the mean degree of g_z nodes and k_z^o is the mean number of links from a g_z node to g_o nodes. P_o^z follows analogously by exchanging the indices.

Equation (1) implies an increase of n_z by g_o nodes being convinced by g_z nodes and a decrease through non-zealot g_z nodes being convinced by g_o nodes. The first term in Eq. (2) describes an increase of m_z by g_z nodes cutting their link to g_o nodes, and the second term consists of an increase due to g_o nodes becoming convinced and a decrease by non-zealot g_z nodes being convinced (analogously for Eq. 3). Note that Eqs. (1)–(3) are closed, i.e. $m_z + m_o + m_{zo} = \overline{k}/2$ and $n_z + n_o = 1$. The main difference to the model in [26] is the presence of zealots included by reducing the fraction n_z in the convincing process by n_z^0.

For the model considered here, five fixed points can be identified as unstable or outside the regime of interest ($0 \le n_z^0 \le n_z \le 1$, $0 \le m_z + m_o \le \overline{k}/2$). A two-dimensional manifold, which represents the consensus state, also satisfies the stationarity criterion:

$$m_z^\star = \frac{\overline{k}}{2} - m_o \quad (m_{zo} = 0). \tag{5}$$

Note that the manifold is extended over all values of n_z and m_o. Its linear stability properties are determined by the eigenvalues of the Jacobian at $m_z^\star$, which are 0, 0 and $f(n_z, m_o, n_z^0, \overline{k}, \phi)$ with

$$f(n_z, m_o, n_z^0, \overline{k}, \phi) = \frac{\phi n_z}{2m_o - \overline{k}} + \frac{2m_o(n_z^0 - 2n_z)(\phi - 1) + (n_z - 1)n_z\phi}{2m_o n_z}. \tag{6}$$

Since two eigenvalues are zero, the manifold cannot be asymptotically stable but (un-)stable if $f(n_z, m_o, n_z^0, \overline{k}, \phi) < 0$ (> 0). In the following it is assumed that the links are, regardless of the initial conditions, homogeneously distributed at consensus, i.e. $m_o^\star = \overline{k}(1-n_z)/2$, which simplifies the nonzero eigenvalue to

$$f(n_z, m_o^\star, n_z^0, \overline{k}, \phi) = 2 - \frac{n_z^0(1-\phi)}{n_z} - \frac{2(1+\overline{k})\phi}{\overline{k}}. \quad (7)$$

The latter changes its sign at

$$\tilde{\phi}_c(n_z, n_z^0, \overline{k}) = 1 - \frac{2n_z}{2(1+\overline{k})n_z - \overline{k}n_z^0}. \quad (8)$$

Thus, the transition depends on $\overline{k}$ such that $\lim_{\overline{k}\to 0} \tilde{\phi}_c = 0$ and $\lim_{\overline{k}\to\infty} \tilde{\phi}_c = 1$. The macroscopic approximation is strictly valid in the case $N \to \infty$; otherwise, finite-size effects may lead to deviations of the system from the analytically calculated behavior.

The fragmentation threshold is approximated by $\tilde{\phi}_c(n_z = 1)$, because at the transition weakly connected clusters split up regardless of their size and $\tilde{\phi}_c$ increases with n_z. This results in

$$\tilde{\phi}_c(1, n_z^0, \overline{k}) = 1 - \frac{1}{1+\overline{k}(1-n_z^0/2)}. \quad (9)$$

Note that for $n_z^0 \ll 1$ the transition can be considered as independent of n_z^0, which is in perfect agreement with the numerical findings in Fig. 1 with $n_z^0 = 0.01 \ll 1$, where the transition is not shifted by changing n_z^0 (Fig. 1(b)) but by a change in k_x (Fig. 1(c)), influencing $\overline{k}$.

We compare the mean-field model and the microscopic model by computing the consensus state values of n_z, m_z and m_o for Eqs. (1)–(3) by forward integration and by taking an average over the outcomes of 200 simulations of the microscopic model (Fig. 4). Both, the excess degree with $k_x = 20$ and the zealot density with $n_z^0 = 0.01$, are kept constant across all simulations. A low mean degree $\overline{k}_0 = 4$ is considered in Fig. 4(a, c, e). Simulations with this setting show a fragmentation transition at $\phi_c \approx 0.5$, which disagrees with the analytical approximation of Eq. (9), $\tilde{\phi}_c \approx 0.814$, marked by a dashed vertical line, by a relative error of $\delta\phi_c = 0.38$. This large discrepancy is to be expected since a large mean degree is necessary for the mean-field approximation to reach a good agreement with the full numerical results of microscopic simulations [31].

In Fig. 4(b, d, f) the mean degree is increased to $\overline{k}_0 = 15$. The numerical results indicate $\phi_c \approx 0.85$, while the analytics give $\tilde{\phi}_c \approx 0.94$, which reduces the discrepancy to a relative error of $\delta\phi_c = 0.096$. The remaining disagreement can be further reduced by including higher-order terms in the AVM [25], which is a promising task for future research. Note that far above and below the transition point, both modeling approaches agree well with each other.

Additionally, in Fig. 4(a, c, e) the validity of the simplification of considering all opinions other than g_z the same as g_o is checked by decreasing γ, which increases the diversity of opinions. Below but close to the phase transition, simulations with a higher diversity show a reduced ZOS due to the higher probability of small groups to cluster and cut their links to the giant component, cf. the black circles in Fig. 4(a). Above and sufficiently below the fragmentation transition, the obtained results are robust for different γ.



FIG. 4. (Color online) Results of microscopic ensemble simulations (symbols) and macroscopic approximation (solid lines) using Eqs. (1)–(3). Mean values have been estimated from 200 simulation runs. (a, b) ZOS efficiency $n_z(t_c)$, (c, d) density of links between convinced nodes $m_z(t_c)$, (e, f) density of links between unconvinced nodes $m_o(t_c)$ at consensus time t_c with $N = 800$ and varying γ as indicated in (e). Same for (b, d, f) but with varying $N = \gamma_0$ and therefore only one opinion different from g_z. The blue dashed vertical line marks the approximated phase transition $\tilde{\phi}_c$ (Eq. (9)). For all runs, $n_z^0 = 0.01$ and $k_x = 20$ have been kept fixed. In (a, c, e), $\overline{k}_0 = 4$; in (b, d, f) $\overline{k}_0 = 15$. Note the different scales along the horizontal axes.

In Fig. 4(b, d, f) we check for finite size effects by simulating at $N = 400$, 800 and 1,600 while keeping the diversity at its minimum ($\gamma = N$). The finite size smoothens the transition from the giant component to the fragmented phase, as can be seen in Fig. 4(b). Here, simulations with the largest number of nodes (green triangles) switch more suddenly to the fragmented phase (compare black circles and green triangles).

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have introduced zealots with an increased mean degree, the excess degree, into the adaptive voter model (AVM) and investigated how their fixed, uniform and new opinion spreads over a social network until a full or fragmented frozen consensus state is reached. The efficiency of zealot opinion spreading (ZOS) has been

quantified by the fraction of nodes holding the zealot opinion at the asymptotic state.

After reproducing the results of a previous study [20] by means of numerical simulation, a detailed comparison of the resulting cluster size distributions below, at and far above the fragmentation transition revealed the existence of zealot-dominated subgraphs if the introduced zealots exhibit an excess degree. These subgraphs are characterized by an elevated mean degree and the presence of opinions enforced by the hub-zealots.

By investigating a wide range of initial zealot densities and excess degrees, three regimes were identified in which different effects allow a maximum or an increased ZOS efficiency. Below the fragmentation transition, maximum ZOS is easily achieved by introducing solely a few zealots without excess degree due to the emergence of a giant component, which allows for ZOS across the whole network. Shortly above the fragmentation transition, an increase of zealot density is insufficient to increase ZOS efficiency. In addition, an excess degree needs to be introduced and raised to a certain level to allow for the system returning to the non-fragmented phase in which ZOS efficiency is quickly maximized. Thereby, either the mean degree of a large amount of zealots is slightly increased by the excess degree, or a small amount of zealots is declared as hubs. Far above the phase transition, only a large density of hub-zealots is able to push the system to the non-fragmented phase. However, the formation of zealot-dominated subgraphs with increased mean degree plays a crucial role and allows for increased ZOS efficiency already far below the phase transition point. Since these subgraphs emerge in the fragmented phase, they only include a specific fraction of nodes, determined by the cluster size distribution.

We have macroscopically approximated the model by considering pairwise interactions. An analytical approximation of the phase transition point was found, which was validated by forward integration. However, the theoretically approximated critical point is much larger than suggested by the numerical simulation of the microscopic model. This discrepancy was reduced by considering systems with larger mean degree. Previous studies [25] suggest the potential for further improvement if the approximation is not only based on pairwise interactions. However, far below and above the phase transition, analytics and numerics agree well with each other.

The finding of zealot-dominated subgraphs with a larger mean degree than in the rest of the graph in the fragmented phase allows drawing the following conclusion: Large communities (sub-networks) with agents engaging in active discourse (larger mean degree as other communities) are likely to be targeted by the interests and the resources of an already convinced group. In our model, an active discussion can imply that there is an attempt to control the system. In order to avoid being controlled by an external opinion, each node should keep links to nodes from other subgraphs.

How to maximize or minimize opinion spreading by zealots is a relevant question in the context of the AVM as well as related models of opinion dynamics. Similar studies already focused on the static voter model [17, 18] or on general dynamical systems [11–14, 32] on static networks. There it was of crucial interest if there exist specific nodes which have topologically favorable or unfavorable positions to spread their opinion, or if there exists a minimum set of nodes necessary to spread an opinion across the whole network. Along these lines it is of interest to quantify the effect of network topology on ZOS efficiency in the AVM in future research. An increase of the rewiring rate changes the topology faster and increases (below the fragmentation transition) the consensus time. Consequently, the larger ϕ the stronger the initial topology is modified. Hence, topological effects are only expected to play a role at low rewiring rates. However, as shown by our study for random graphs, in this regime opinion spreading is already maximized by randomly positioning a small number of zealots without excess degree. For networks with a more complex topology than a random graph, the corresponding effect might be quantitatively or even qualitatively different. Above the transition point, especially the topological effects on cluster formation with increased mean degree are of interest.

More generally, this study also presented a strong motivation for studying the controllability of the AVM as an example for a nonlinear dynamical system on a dynamic network. This is because the ZOS efficiency, on which we have focused our interest, does not represent exactly the controllable subset of the zealots, but might be closely related to this concept. If the ZOS efficiency would represent the subset of nodes controllable by the zealots, we could drive this subset from any initial state to any desired state within a time t_c by an appropriate input signal. However, the ZOS efficiency only shows that we drove the subset to a specific, not an arbitrary, state.

This study is based on the approach of intervening in the opinion adoption process in the AVM. Clearly, a complementary approach would be to interfere with the rewiring process, which could imply to declare specific links as unbreakable or harder to break. Also, the creation of links between zealots by rewiring could be excluded, assuming that campaigners or lobbyists have no interest in clustering among themselves. First, it would be easier to identify them as zealots and second, they would waste their linkage resource needed for influencing other nodes. The combination of intervening in opinion adoption and rewiring processes, considerations regarding the role of complex network topology and generalizing those approaches to more realistic models of social network dynamics (e.g., [21, 33]) are promising fields of future research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

P.P.K., M.W. and R.V.D. have been financially supported by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) via the Young Investigators Group CoSy-CC^2 (grant no. 01LN1306A). J.F.D. thanks the Stordalen Foundation (via the Planetary Boundary Research Network PB.net) and the Earth League's EarthDoc program for financial support. The authors gratefully acknowledge the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research and the Land Brandenburg for supporting this project by providing resources on the high performance computer system at the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research. The presented research was conducted within the scope of the COPAN flagship project on co-evolutionary pathways at the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (`http://www.pik-potsdam.de/copan`).

[1] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 47 (2002).
[2] M. E. J. Newman, SIAM Rev. **45**, 167 (2003).
[3] M. Mobilia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 028701 (2003).
[4] M. Mobilia, A. Petersen, and S. Redner, J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp. **2007**, P08029 (2007).
[5] F. Amblard and G. Deffuant, Physica A **343**, 725 (2004).
[6] D. W. Franks, J. Noble, P. Kaufmann, and S. Stagl, Adapt. Behav. **16**, 264 (2008).
[7] F. Sélley, Á. Besenyei, I. Z. Kiss, and P. L. Simon, SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst. **14**, 168 (2015).
[8] T. Gross, C. J. Dommar D'Lima, and B. Blasius, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 208701 (2006).
[9] R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3200 (2001).
[10] R. May and A. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 066112 (2001).
[11] Y.-Y. Liu, J.-J. Slotine, and A.-L. Barabási, Nature **473**, 167 (2011).
[12] Z. Yuan, C. Zhao, Z. Di, W.-X. Wang, and Y.-C. Lai, Nat. Commun. **4**, 2447 (2013).
[13] N. J. Cowan, E. J. Chastain, D. A. Vilhena, J. S. Freudenberg, and C. T. Bergstrom, PLoS One **7**, e38398 (2012).
[14] J. C. Nacher and T. Akutsu, New J. Phys. **14**, 073005 (2012).
[15] F. Sorrentino, M. di Bernardo, F. Garofalo, and G. Chen, Phys. Rev. E **75**, 046103 (2007).
[16] J. Xie, S. Sreenivasan, G. Korniss, W. Zhang, C. Lim, and B. K. Szymanski, Phys. Rev. E **84**, 011130 (2011).
[17] E. Yildiz, D. Acemoglu, A. Ozdaglar, A. Saberi, and A. Scaglione, ACM Trans. Econ. Comput. **1**, 19 (2013).
[18] F. Wu and B. Huberman, (2004), arXiv:cond-mat/0407252.
[19] P. Holme, Eur. Phys. J. B **88**, 234 (2015).
[20] P. Holme and M. E. J. Newman, Phys. Rev. E **74**, 056108 (2006).
[21] C.-F. Schleussner, J. F. Donges, D. A. Engemann, and A. Levermann, Sci. Rep. **6**, 30790 (2016).
[22] M. Pósfai and P. Hövel, New J. Phys. **16**, 123055 (2014).
[23] Y. Pan and X. Li, PLoS One **9**, e94998 (2014).
[24] R. D. Enos and A. Fowler, Polit. Sci. Res. Methods , doi:10.1017/psrm.2016.21 (in press).
[25] D. Kimura and Y. Hayakawa, Phys. Rev. E **78**, 016103 (2008).
[26] M. Wiedermann, J. F. Donges, J. Heitzig, W. Lucht, and J. Kurths, Phys. Rev. E **91**, 052801 (2015).
[27] H. Silk, G. Demirel, M. Homer, and T. Gross, New J. Phys. **16**, 093051 (2014).
[28] G. A. Böhme and T. Gross, Phys. Rev. E **83**, 035101 (2011).
[29] G. Demirel, F. Vazquez, G. A. Böhme, and T. Gross, Physica D **267**, 68 (2014).
[30] P. Erdös and A. Rényi, Publ. Math. **6**, 290 (1959).
[31] J. P. Gleeson, S. Melnik, J. A. Ward, M. A. Porter, and P. J. Mucha, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 026106 (2012).
[32] J. Sun and A. E. Motter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 208701 (2013).
[33] W. Barfuss, J. F. Donges, M. Wiedermann, and W. Lucht, Earth Syst. Dyn. Discuss. **2016**, 15 (2016).